

## **REMARKS**

The Examiner is thanked for courtesies extended during telephonic interviews with Applicants' representative, the undersigned.

Applicants have considered the Notice of Allowability, and Examiner's Amendment mailed June 30, 2004 in connection with the above-identified patent application and respectfully request entry of the instant Amendment and remarks to the file history of the above-identified application.

### **Drawings**

The Examiner has required correction to informalities in the Drawings filed March 30, 1999, as referenced in the "Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review" ("Draftsperson's Notice"), form PTO-948 dated July 1, 1999.

Specifically, Applicants note that the Draftsperson has indicated that the listed Figures (Figures 1, 8, 9, and 10) do not meet the requirements of 37 C.F.R. § 1.84(h)(2). However, this section of the rules covers multiple partial views of a single "large machine or device" that are either distributed over a single sheet or spread over several sheets. Applicants representative has studied the Draftsperson's Notice but can see no offending issues in respect of the listed Figures. In particular, none of the listed Figures comprises multiple partial views of a single object. Figure 1, for example, shows a single item. Applicants can also see no aspect in which the listed figures differ from any of the other figures for which no objection has been raised. In summary, Applicants do not see that any aspect of this rule applies to the listed Figures and are, therefore, unable to provide corrected drawings without more specific guidance on the nature of the informalities that require correction.

Accordingly, the Examiner's assistance in interpreting the Draftsperson's comments is kindly solicited. Applicants respectfully ask the Examiner to obtain a clarification of the nature of the Draftsperson's objections and to communicate such clarification to Applicants in her next official action.

### **Amendments to the Claims**

Claims 1-16, 31-42, and 52-62 are pending in the subject Application. With this Amendment, Applicants amend claim 1 to more particularly recite that which Applicants consider to be their invention.

Prior to amendment, herein, claim 1 recited the terms, “nuclear receptor coactivator binding site”, and “coactivator binding site of a nuclear receptor”. With the instant amendment, Applicants amend claim 1 so that the first term, “nuclear receptor coactivator binding site” replaces the second, “coactivator binding site of a nuclear receptor” where it appears, thereby providing proper antecedent basis for the former. As a result, Applicants expect that the language of the claim will be clearer on its face.

No new matter is introduced by the Amendment herein, which is merely ministerial in nature, and, accordingly, entry thereof is respectfully requested.

### CONCLUSION

In view of the above remarks, Applicants respectfully submit that the subject application is in good and proper order for allowance. Withdrawal of the Examiner’s rejections and early notification to this effect are earnestly solicited. If, in the opinion of the Examiner, a telephone conference would expedite the prosecution of the subject application, the Examiner is encouraged to call the undersigned at (650) 843-4000.

No fee is believed owed in connection with filing of this amendment and response other than the fee associated with the RCE, authorized on the accompanying transmittal. Nevertheless, should the Commissioner determine otherwise, he is authorized to charge any underpayment or credit any overpayment to Morgan, Lewis & Bockius LLP Deposit Account No. 50-0310 (order no. 61040-0008 US) for the appropriate amount. A copy of this sheet is attached.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: July 29, 2004

---

Richard G. A. Bone  
Limited recognition under 37 C.F.R. § 10.9(b)  
(Copy of certificate attached hereto.)

*for* Thomas D. Kohler, Reg. No. 32,797  
**MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP**  
3300 Hillview Avenue  
Palo Alto, California 94304  
(650) 493-4935